

REMARKS

General

The present is in response to the Office Action dated June 19, 2007, where the Examiner has objected to Claims 1-21 and objected to the drawings. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 21. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-21 are objected to by the Examiner.

By this amendment:

Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 21 have been amended.

No Claims have been canceled.

Response to objection of the Drawings

The drawings have not been amended. The specification has been amended to correct various typographical errors relating to the objection of the drawings.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as "failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)" because the Examiner states that various reference characters designate the same term. For example, the Examiner states that "reference characters '110' (figure 1) and '210' (figure 2) have both been used to designate 'transformer'." Applicants respectfully submit that the use of generic terms to describe multiple embodiments of a component is proper. In the present case, FIGURE 1 comprises a generic configuration of a "narrowband interference excision device according to

one embodiment of the invention." (emphasis added) (see specification at page 5, lines 18-19)

The components of FIG. 1 are further defined as embodiments in FIGS. 2-5. Similarly, FIGURE 6 is a generic method, which FIGS. 7-9 define further embodiments. Applicants submit that the use of a singular term to describe a generic component is proper, and thus, the drawings are proper.

Further, the Examiner objects to the drawings as "failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include" reference characters not mentioned in the description.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors that affect the drawings. Thus, reference characters "730" and "1000" have been amended into the specification without adding new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings are now in condition for allowance.

Further, the Examiner objects to the drawings as "failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include" reference signs mentioned in the description. Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors that affect the drawings. Thus, reference character "700" now reads "730", "800" now reads "840", "900" now reads "950" and "10000" now reads "1000". Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings are now in condition for allowance.

Response to objection of the Specification (Abstract)

The Examiner objected to the specification as "the abstract of the disclosure is objected to because [it] (sic) uses the form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as 'means' and 'said'." To overcome this objection, Applicants have amended the abstract to change the

word "said" to "the." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the abstract is now in condition for allowance.

Response to objection of Claims due to informalities

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1-21 due to informalities. To overcome such objections, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 14 and 21 to add the word "and." In addition, Claim 21 has been amended to change the term "ELF" to "Extremely Low Frequency (ELF)." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14 and 21 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner objected to Claims 7 and 11 "under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only." Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 7 and 11 are not multiple dependent claims because they only refer to a previous claim (vs. multiple previous claims). Specifically, Claim 7 states, "The method of Claim 2," which is a proper dependent claim. Claim 7 further states, "obtaining said current power vector from said estimating a plurality of power values step (b) of Claim 1," which is proper to refer to claim from which Claim 2 depends upon for purposes of clarity. Claim 7 does not attempt to state, "The method of Claim 2 and Claim1," which would be an improper multiple dependent claim. Instead, Claim 7 properly depends on Claim 2, which depends on Claim 1, and thus, Claim 7 is not a multiple dependent claim. Similarly, Claim 11 is also not a multiple dependent claim as Claim 11 recites, "The method of Claim 9," which is a proper dependent claim, and not a multiple dependent claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7 and 11 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 10-12 due to informalities. To overcome such objections, Applicants have amended Claims 10-12 to correct typographical errors. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10-12 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1-21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-21 are now in condition for allowance.

No fee is required for this response.

Respectfully submitted,

SPAWAR SYSTEMS CENTER SAN DIEGO
OFFICE OF PATENT COUNSEL 20012

By /Allan Lee/

Allan Y. Lee
Registration No. 43,744
(619) 553-3818